

Open quantum systems in two environments

Hichem Eleuch^{1*} and Ingrid Rotter^{2†}

¹ *Institute for Quantum Science and Engineering,*

Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843, USA and

² *Max Planck Institute for the Physics of Complex Systems, D-01187 Dresden, Germany*

(Dated: March 14, 2017)

Abstract

Calculations for open quantum systems are performed usually by taking into account their embedding into one common environment, which is mostly the common continuum of scattering wavefunctions. Realistic quantum systems are coupled however often to more than one continuum. For example, the conductance of an open cavity needs at least two environments, namely the input and the output channel. In the present paper, we study generic features of an open quantum system coupled to two channels. We compare the results with those characteristic of a one-channel system. Of special interest is the parameter range which is influenced by singular (exceptional) points. Here, the states of the system are mixed via the environment and the dynamics is determined, in any case, by nonlinear processes. These processes restore the resonance structure of the cross section in the one-channel case, such that there is no need to consider them in calculations for concrete systems. In the two-channel case, however, they cause new effects. Most interesting is the enhanced conductance of an open cavity in this parameter range. This enhancement follows directly from the properties of the eigenstates of a non-Hermitian Hamilton operator (and is not related to the existence of a superradiant state). The study of the conductance allows, among others, an experimental test of the non-Hermitian quantum physics.

* email: hichemeleuch@tamu.edu

† email: rotter@pks.mpg.de

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum systems are localized in a finite well-defined space area. This area may be determined by certain boundary conditions (e.g. in quantum dots or quantum billiards) or by self-organization (e.g. in atomic nuclei). The shape of the nucleus is, indeed, an essential part of nuclear spectroscopic investigations and is characteristic of every nucleus. It may be spherical as well as oblate or prolate or even more complicated, see [1].

The spectroscopic properties of quantum systems are studied usually by means of a Hermitian Hamilton operator H , the eigenstates of which are discrete. Due to the embedding of the system into a continuum of scattering wavefunctions, the lifetimes of its states become usually finite. This agrees with the experimentally well-known finite lifetime of the states of a quantum system which is described in the standard Hermitian quantum theory by means of the tunneling mechanism. An exception are the well-known bound states in the continuum the lifetime of which is infinitely long. These states occur under special conditions and are described well in different papers for different systems, e.g. [2–5].

Moreover, the embedding of a quantum system into a continuum of scattering wavefunctions causes another effect which can, as a matter of principle, not be simulated in standard Hermitian quantum theory: since every state of the system is coupled to the continuum, all the states of the system may mix via the environment. This so-called external mixing (EM) of the states is a second-order process and occurs additionally to the well-known direct (internal) mixing of the states which is contained in the Hermitian Hamiltonian H .

Experimentally, an example of EM has been provided a few years ago in a mesoscopic system. It has been shown in [6] that two distinct quantum states are coupled through a common continuum. In a further experiment, the authors were able to show that EM survives even under conditions of strongly nonequilibrium transport in the system [7].

A possible EM of quantum states is very seldom considered in theory since it is fully beyond Hermitian theory. However, it can easily be taken into account when the properties of the system are described by a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$. In such a case, EM is involved explicitly in the eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{H}$, see [8–12].

In [12] the, at first glance, unexpected result has been found that EM needs not to be considered when the system is embedded in a common environment of scattering wavefunctions. This result corresponds to the experience obtained from many numerical studies on

realistic systems in which EM is not at all considered. Also the influence of the singular exceptional points (EP) is not involved in these standard calculations.

Nevertheless, these results are not in contradiction with the statement of non-Hermitian quantum physics that EP and EM may influence, to a great extent, the spectroscopic properties of open quantum systems. The point is that EPs cause nonlinear processes in their neighborhood [8–10] which are able to compensate the contributions that arise from the EM of the states via the common environment [12]. Correspondingly, the cross section shows the same resonance structure in the one-channel case when calculated with EPs and EM or without them.

The situation is however another one when the system is embedded not only in one common environment, but in several environments which exist independently of one another. An example of such a situation is the decay of a nuclear state into different states of the residual nucleus by emission of a nucleon. In such a case, we have the different widths $\gamma_i^{(c)}$ (called usually partial widths) that characterize the decay of the state i of the system in one of the open channels c . The different channels are defined by the decay of the state i into different states of the residual nucleus by emission of a nucleon. A channel is open when the energy difference between the state i and the state of the residual nucleus is positive, i.e. when the emission of a particle is allowed.

Another example is the transmission through, e.g., a quantum dot. In this case, at least two different environments exist, namely that of the entrance channel and that of the exit channel. Several numerical studies performed with a non-Hermitian Hamilton operator $\mathcal{H}$ on the basis of the tight-binding model have shown interesting non-trivial results [13, 14]: the transmission probability is anticorrelated with the phase rigidity of the eigenfunctions of the non-Hermitian Hamilton operator (when averaged over energy in a certain energy window). That means it depends on internal properties of the eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{H}$.

An enhancement of transmission through quantum dots or quantum billiards is found also in other studies, mostly by varying the coupling strength of the system to the environment. In [15, 16], complex scaling is used while in [17, 18] the formation of a superradiant state under certain conditions is considered. Neither in [13, 14] nor in [15, 16], the enhancement of the transmission is related to the existence of a special superradiant state (that appears together with subradiant states). The enhancement of the transmission in these studies is rather caused by the internal properties of the eigenstates of the non-Hermitian Hamilton

operator $\mathcal{H}$, above all by the properties of its eigenfunctions.

It is the aim of the present paper to find typical spectroscopic features of an open quantum system that is coupled to two environments, which are independent of one another. In Sect. II, we sketch the formalism used by us; and in Sect. III we show some typical numerical results. A discussion of the obtained results can be found in Sect. IV while some conclusions are drawn in Sect. V. Here, we bring into focus a possible experimental test of non-Hermitian quantum physics.

II. NON-HERMITIAN HAMILTONIAN $\mathcal{H}$ OF AN OPEN QUANTUM SYSTEM

A. Eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{H}^{(2,1)}$

To begin with, we sketch the features typical for an open quantum system embedded in one common continuum. Details can be found in [8] and, above all, in [12]. They can be discussed by means of the 2×2 non-Hermitian matrix

$$\mathcal{H}^{(2,1)} = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_1^{(1)} \equiv e_1^{(1)} + \frac{i}{2}\gamma_1^{(1)} & \omega^{(1)} \\ \omega^{(1)} & \varepsilon_2^{(1)} \equiv e_2^{(1)} + \frac{i}{2}\gamma_2^{(1)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

Here, $\varepsilon_i^{(1)}$ are two complex eigenvalues of the basic non-Hermitian operator coupled to the environment 1 (called also channel 1) [19]. The $e_i^{(1)}$ are the energies of the states i and the $\gamma_i^{(1)}$ are their widths. The $\omega^{(1)}$ stand for the coupling matrix elements of the two states via the common environment 1. They are complex where $\text{Re}(\omega^{(1)})$ arises from the principal value integral and $\text{Im}(\omega^{(1)})$ from the residuum [8]. The complex eigenvalues $\mathcal{E}_i^{(1)} \equiv E_i^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_i^{(1)}$ of $\mathcal{H}^{(2,1)}$ give the energies $E_i^{(1)}$ and widths $\Gamma_i^{(1)}$ of the states of the localized part of the system.

In (1), a singular point may appear, the so-called EP, at which two eigenvalues of $\mathcal{H}^{(2,1)}$ coalesce [20]. At these points, the two corresponding eigenfunctions are not orthogonal. Instead

$$\Phi_1^{\text{cr}} \rightarrow \pm i \Phi_2^{\text{cr}}; \quad \Phi_2^{\text{cr}} \rightarrow \mp i \Phi_1^{\text{cr}} \quad (2)$$

according to analytical and numerical results [21–24]. An EP is, according to its definition, related to the common environment in which the system is embedded. In other words, it is well defined under the condition that the system is embedded in only one continuum.

The eigenfunctions of a non-Hermitian Hamilton operator are biorthogonal

$$\mathcal{H}|\Phi_i\rangle = \mathcal{E}_i|\Phi_i\rangle \quad \langle\Psi_i|\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{E}_i\langle\Psi_i| . \quad (3)$$

In the case of the symmetric 2×2 Hamiltonian (1), it is

$$\Psi_i = \Phi_i^* \quad (4)$$

and the eigenfunctions should be normalized according to

$$\langle\Phi_i^*|\Phi_j\rangle = \delta_{ij} \quad (5)$$

in order to smoothly describe the transition from a closed system with discrete states to a weakly open one with narrow resonance states. As a consequence of (5), the values of the standard expressions are changed,

$$\langle\Phi_i|\Phi_i\rangle = \text{Re} (\langle\Phi_i|\Phi_i\rangle) ; \quad A_i \equiv \langle\Phi_i|\Phi_i\rangle \geq 1 \quad (6)$$

$$\langle\Phi_i|\Phi_{j \neq i}\rangle = i \text{Im} (\langle\Phi_i|\Phi_{j \neq i}\rangle) = -\langle\Phi_{j \neq i}|\Phi_i\rangle$$

$$|B_i^j| \equiv |\langle\Phi_i|\Phi_{j \neq i}\rangle| \geq 0 . \quad (7)$$

Furthermore, the phase rigidity which is a quantitative measure for the biorthogonality of the eigenfunctions,

$$r_k \equiv \frac{\langle\Phi_k^*|\Phi_k\rangle}{\langle\Phi_k|\Phi_k\rangle} = A_k^{-1} , \quad (8)$$

is smaller than 1. Far from an EP, $r_k \approx 1$ while it approaches the value $r_k = 0$ when an EP is approached.

Additionally to the Hamiltonian (1), we will consider the non-Hermitian matrix

$$\mathcal{H}_0^{(2,1)} = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_1^{(1)} \equiv e_1^{(1)} + \frac{i}{2}\gamma_1^{(1)} & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon_2^{(1)} \equiv e_2^{(1)} + \frac{i}{2}\gamma_2^{(1)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

which describes the system without any mixing of its states via the environment. In other words, $\omega = 0$ corresponds to vanishing EM of the eigenstates. The eigenfunctions Φ_i of $\mathcal{H}^{(2,1)}$ can be represented in the set of eigenfunctions $\{\Phi_i^0\}$ of $\mathcal{H}_0^{(2,1)}$,

$$\Phi_i = \sum b_{ij} \Phi_j^0 ; \quad b_{ij} = \langle\Phi_j^0|\Phi_i\rangle \quad (10)$$

under the condition that the b_{ij} are normalized by $\sum_j (b_{ij})^2 = 1$. The coefficients $|b_{ij}|^2$ differ from the $(b_{ij})^2$. They contain the information on the strength of EM.

The main features characteristic of open quantum systems are described well by the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of (1). Typical values related to the eigenfunctions are the phase rigidity (8) and the contribution of EM (10) to their purity. All these values contain the influence of the environment. They are proven experimentally, for details see [8, 12, 25].

B. Schrödinger equation with $\mathcal{H}^{(2,1)}$

The Schrödinger equation $(\mathcal{H}^{(2,1)} - \mathcal{E}_i^{(1)})|\Phi_i^{(1)}\rangle = 0$ may be rewritten into a Schrödinger equation with source term [8, 12],

$$(\mathcal{H}_0^{(2,1)} - \mathcal{E}_i^{(1)}) |\Phi_i^{(1)}\rangle = - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \omega \\ \omega & 0 \end{pmatrix} |\Phi_i^{(1)}\rangle. \quad (11)$$

In this representation, the coupling ω of the states i and $j \neq i$ of the localized system via the common environment of scattering wavefunctions (EM) is contained in the source term of the Schrödinger equation, for details see [8].

Far from EPs, the coupling of the localized system to the environment influences the spectroscopic properties of the system only marginally [8, 12]. The influence is however nonvanishing also in this case, see e.g. the experimental results [26].

In the neighborhood of EPs, the coupling between system and environment causes – according to mathematical studies – nonlinear effects in the Schrödinger equation (11), see [8, 12]. Among others, these effects lead to a conservation of the resonance structure of the cross section in the one-channel case which is unaffected by EM and by the existence of EPs. Thus, the one-channel case cannot be used in order to test the results of the non-Hermitian formalism.

C. Eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{H}^{(2,2)}$

Let us consider the 4×4 non-Hermitian matrix

$$\mathcal{H}^{(2,2)} = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_1^{(1)} & \omega^{(1)} & 0 & 0 \\ \omega^{(1)} & \varepsilon_2^{(1)} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \varepsilon_1^{(2)} & \omega^{(2)} \\ 0 & 0 & \omega^{(2)} & \varepsilon_2^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

Here, $\varepsilon_i^{(1)} \equiv e_i^{(1)} + \frac{i}{2}\gamma_i^{(1)}$ and $\varepsilon_i^{(2)} \equiv e_i^{(2)} + \frac{i}{2}\gamma_i^{(2)}$ are the complex eigenvalues of the basic non-Hermitian operator $\mathcal{H}^{(2,2)}$ relative to channel 1 and 2, respectively [19]. Usually $\varepsilon_i^{(1)} \neq \varepsilon_i^{(2)}$. The $\omega^{(1)}$ and $\omega^{(2)}$ stand for the coupling matrix elements of the two states via the environment 1 and 2, respectively.

The eigenvalues $\mathcal{E}_i^{(c)} \equiv E_i^{(c)} + \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_i^{(c)}$ and eigenfunctions $\Phi_i^{(c)}$ of (12) are characterized by two numbers: the number i of the state ($i = 1, 2$) of the localized part of the system and the number c of the channel ($c = 1, 2$), called environment, in which the system is embedded. Usually, $E_i^{(1)} \neq E_i^{(2)}$ and $\Gamma_i^{(1)} \neq \Gamma_i^{(2)}$. Also the wave functions $\Phi_i^{(1)}$ and $\Phi_i^{(2)}$ differ from one another due to the EM of the eigenstates via the environment 1 and 2, respectively. That means, the system has four states, from a mathematical point of view.

The two environments are different from and orthogonal to one another. Further, the two eigenstates with equal i and different c arise from the same state i of the localized part of the system. The zeros in the matrix (12) express the corresponding fact that the two eigenstates i relative to the two channels 1 and 2 of $\mathcal{H}^{(2,2)}$ cannot interact with one another.

We mention here that the Hamiltonian (12) is formally the same as the Hamiltonian (24) in [27]. There is however a fundamental difference: in (24) in [27], the whole system is *fully* embedded into both environments (1) and (2) which both are of completely different nature and exist independently of one another. In contrast to this, the Hamiltonian (12) describes a system, the states of which are embedded partially in each of the two different environments. These two different environments are also independent of one another. They are, however, nothing but *parts* of the total environment.

Without an EP in the considered parameter range in relation to both channels, we have $E_i^{(1)} \approx E_i^{(2)}$, $\Gamma_i^{(1)} \approx \Gamma_i^{(2)}$ and $\Phi_i^{(1)} \approx \Phi_i^{(2)}$. This case is realized in the decay of nuclear states since their decay probability can be determined only when the decaying state is well isolated from other states. Otherwise, new problems arise from the overlapping with other states

[28].

Under the influence of an EP relative to $c = 1$ and (or) relative to $c = 2$, the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions will be, however, different, $E_i^{(1)} \neq E_i^{(2)}$, $\Gamma_i^{(1)} \neq \Gamma_i^{(2)}$ and $\Phi_i^{(1)} \neq \Phi_i^{(2)}$ in the corresponding parameter range. Such a situation may occur in transmission through a quantum dot or quantum billiard [13, 14]. This case will be considered in detail in the following section.

In analogy to (9), we will consider also the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_0^{(2,2)} = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_1^{(1)} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon_2^{(1)} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \varepsilon_1^{(2)} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \varepsilon_2^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (13)$$

which describes the system without any mixing of its states via any environment. In other words, $\omega^{(1)} = \omega^{(2)} = 0$ corresponds to vanishing EM of the eigenstates via an environment. The mixing of the eigenstates of (12) can be represented in a set of eigenfunctions of (13) in complete analogy to the relation (10) for two states coupled to one common environment.

D. Schrödinger equation with $\mathcal{H}^{(2,2)}$

Using (13), we can write down the Schrödinger equation with source term for the two-channel case in analogy to (11) for the one-channel case. The corresponding equation reads

$$(\mathcal{H}_0^{(2,2)} - \mathcal{E}_i^{(c)}) |\Phi_i^{(c)}\rangle = - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \omega^{(1)} & 0 & 0 \\ \omega^{(1)} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega^{(2)} \\ 0 & 0 & \omega^{(2)} & 0 \end{pmatrix} |\Phi_i^{(c)}\rangle. \quad (14)$$

The source depends on the coupling of the system to both channels, i.e. on $\omega^{(1)}$ and on $\omega^{(2)}$.

Under the special condition $\omega^{(1)} = \omega^{(2)} \equiv \omega$, the source term of (14) depends on the only value ω . Hence it is similar to that of the one-channel case (11). The situation is completely different in the general case with two channels (two environments) in which $\omega^{(1)} \neq \omega^{(2)} \neq 0$. We will show results of numerical calculations in the following section.

We repeat here that, according to their definition [20], EPs occur only in the one-channel case, i.e. only in the two submatrices related to channel 1 and channel 2, respectively. They

are not defined in the 4×4 matrix (12). However, the EPs of the two submatrices in (12) may influence the dynamics of the open two-channel system.

E. Non-Hermitian Hamiltonian and resonance structure of the S matrix

The resonance structure of the S matrix containing two resonance states, can be obtained from the expression

$$S = \frac{(E - E_1 - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_1)(E - E_2 - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_2)}{(E - E_1 + \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_1)(E - E_2 + \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_2)} \quad (15)$$

which is derived in [29] for the case that two resonance states are coupled to a common continuum of scattering wavefunctions, see also [8, 12]. The expression (15) is unitary. According to (15), the resonance structure of the cross section is determined exclusively by the spectroscopic values of the localized part of the system, i.e. by the eigenvalues $\mathcal{E}_i = E_i + i/2 \Gamma_i$ of the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$. The expression (15) allows us therefore to receive reliable results also in the two-channel case and, moreover, when the phase rigidity of the eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{H}$ is reduced, $r_k < 1$, and when the eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{H}$ contain EM, i.e. when they are mixed in the set of eigenfunctions $\{\Phi_i^0\}$ of $\mathcal{H}_0$ according to (10).

As shown in [8, 12], the S matrix contains, generally, nonlinear effects which are caused by an EM of the resonance states via the environment. The one-channel case does, however, not allow us to prove the existence of these nonlinear effects and of EM, since the resonance structure of the cross section calculated with and without EM is the same in this case [12]. This result agrees, on the one hand, with the experience received from many different numerical studies in realistic cases which are performed without taking into account EM. On the other hand, it is not in contradiction with the conclusions received from the study of non-Hermitian physics of open quantum systems.

According to the results obtained in [12], the evolution of the system near to an EP is driven exclusively by the nonlinear source term of the Schrödinger equation (11) which describes the coupling of the localized part of the system to the common environment and is characteristic of the open quantum system embedded in one environment. The calculations in [12] are performed without varying ω , i.e. ω can not be responsible for the width bifurcation occurring in these calculations under the influence of an EP. Obviously, the nonlinear

source term is the driving force. It is able, in the one-channel case, to largely conserve the resonance structure of the cross section.

The conservation of the resonance structure of the cross section which is possible in the one-channel case, is expected to be impossible, generally, in the two-channel (or more-channel) case according to (14) since, generally, $\omega^{(1)} \neq \omega^{(2)} \neq 0$. This gives the chance to test non-Hermitian quantum physics by means of the two-channel case. We will provide numerical results and discuss their physical meaning in the following sections of the present paper.

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

A. Eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{H}^{(2,2)}$

For illustration, we show in Fig. 1 a few typical numerical results for two states in the two-channel case. The results of the left column are obtained for the special case $\omega^{(1)} = \omega^{(2)}$ and those of the right column for the general case $\omega^{(1)} \neq \omega^{(2)}$. The numerical results for the eigenvalue trajectories $\mathcal{E}_i^{(1,2)} \equiv E_i^{(1,2)} + \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_i^{(1,2)}$ and the eigenfunction trajectories $\Phi_i^{(1,2)}$ of the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}^{(2,2)}$ are obtained by starting from parameter-dependent energies $e_i^{(1,2)}$ and parameter-independent widths $\gamma_i^{(1,2)}$. We consider two different cases: in one case, the widths $\gamma_i^{(1,2)}$ of the two states are equal, $\gamma_i^{(1)} = \gamma_i^{(2)}$ (correspondingly to $\omega^{(1)} = \omega^{(2)}$), while they are different from one another in the other case, $\gamma_i^{(1)} \neq \gamma_i^{(2)}$.

The eigenvalue trajectories Figs. 1.a,b and 1.f,g, respectively, show two EPs between which the widths $\Gamma_i^{(1,2)}$ bifurcate. At the critical parameter value $a = a^{\text{cr}}$ width bifurcation is maximum. Here the phase rigidity approaches the value 1 (Figs. 1.d and 1.i), meaning that two states become (almost) orthogonal at this parameter value. The EM of the states via the continuum can not be neglected at this parameter value (Figs. 1.e and 1.j).

While the eigenvalue trajectories of $\mathcal{H}^{(2,2)}$ are influenced by an EP mainly in its very neighborhood, the eigenfunction trajectories are influenced in a comparably large parameter range. This can be seen, above all, in the phase rigidity (Figs. 1.c,d,h,i) which is a quantitative measure for the biorthogonality of the eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{H}^{(2,2)}$. This holds true in the one-channel case [12] as well as in the two-channel case considered in Fig. 1.

Although an EP is defined in relation to only one channel, a hint to its position can




FIG. 1: Eigenvalues $\mathcal{E}_i^{(1,2)} \equiv E_i^{(1,2)} + \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_i^{(1,2)}$ and eigenfunctions $\Phi_i^{(1,2)}$ of the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}^{(2,2)}$ as a function of a . $\omega^{(1)} = \omega^{(2)} = 0.5i$ (left), $\omega^{(1)} = 0.5i$; $\omega^{(2)} = 0.1i$ (right). Parameters: $e_1 = 1 - a/2$; $e_2 = a$; left: $\gamma_1^{(1)}/2 = -0.4$; $\gamma_1^{(2)} = -0.35$; $\gamma_2^{(1)}/2 = -0.35$; $\gamma_2^{(2)}/2 = -0.4$ (dashed lines in a, b); right: $\gamma_1^{(1)}/2 = -0.4$; $\gamma_1^{(2)} = -0.08$; $\gamma_2^{(1)}/2 = -0.35$; $\gamma_2^{(2)}/2 = -0.09$ (dashed lines in f, g). At the critical parameter value $a = a^{\text{cr}} = 0.6494$, the phase rigidity r_i approaches the value 1.

be seen in its neighborhood in the eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{H}^{(2,2)}$: the phase rigidity r_i decreases, indeed, at the position of an EP. It does however not approach the value zero (Figs. 1.c and 1.h). This is true not only when $\gamma_i^{(1)} = \gamma_i^{(2)}$ but also when $\gamma_i^{(1)} \neq \gamma_i^{(2)}$.

Similar results are obtained by starting from parameter-independent energies $e_i^{(1,2)}$ and

parameter-dependent widths $\gamma_i^{(1,2)}$. In difference to the results shown in Fig. 1, the eigenvalues show, in this case, level repulsion (appearing in the $E_i^{(1,2)}$) between the two EPs, while the widths $\Gamma_i^{(1,2)}$ of the two states are the same in this parameter range. These results correspond to those obtained in the one-channel case [12].

B. Resonance structure and contour plot of transmission

Interesting information on the spectroscopic properties of the localized part of the system is contained in the resonance structure of the cross section which can be observed experimentally. We consider the transition from channel 1 to channel 2 which simulates transmission. Using (15), we have calculated the resonance structure of the transmission at the critical parameter value a^{cr} and at two values of a beyond the critical range.

In Fig. 2, the results without EM (corresponding to $\omega^{(1)} = \omega^{(2)} = 0$) are shown. There appear four states, indeed, according to the results of analytical studies.

Characteristic of the resonance structure of the cross section of a two-level system coupled to *one* channel is its double-hump structure around maximum width bifurcation [8, 12]. Figs. 3 and 4 show the transmission through a two-level system coupled to *two* channels in the analog parameter range around maximum width bifurcation. These figures illustrate that the double-hump structure of the cross section is restored in the transmission (i.e. in the two-channel case) under the influence of EM.

In Fig. 3 (with different coupling strengths $\omega^{(1)} \gg \omega^{(2)}$ according to the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of Fig. 1 right), the double-hump structure around the maximum width distribution is very similar, indeed, to that of the cross section in the one-channel case (solid black line in Fig. 2 compared to solid black line in Fig. 4.a in [12]). The contour plot of the transmission is however much richer than the cross section in the one-channel case. This is reflected also in the dotted (blue) and dashed (red) lines of Fig. 3.a.

More interesting are the results shown in Fig. 4 corresponding to the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of Fig. 1 left with $\omega^{(1)} = \omega^{(2)}$. Here, the double-hump structure also appears. The bumps are however broadened in energy. Due to this broadening, the transmission is enhanced in a comparably large energy window. In this energy window, the phase rigidity averaged over energy, is reduced (see Fig. 1).




FIG. 2: Resonance structure (above) and contour plot (below) of the transmission with vanishing external mixing $\omega^{(1)} = \omega^{(2)} = 0$. The parameters are the same as in Fig. 1 left. Above: black: $a = a^{\text{cr}} = 0.6949$; red: $a_1 = 1.3$; blue: $a_2 = 0.0$.

IV. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

The results shown in Figs. 1 to 4 show very clearly that the mixing of the states via the environment (EM) plays an important role in open quantum systems. This mixing is a second-order effect and does not appear in standard Hermitian quantum physics. While its influence onto the spectroscopic properties of the localized part of the system far from singu-




FIG. 3: The same as Fig. 2 but $\omega^{(1)} \gg \omega^{(2)} \neq 0$. The parameters are the same as in Fig. 1 right.

lar points is usually small, it becomes important and determines the dynamics of the system in a finite neighborhood of singular points. Such points are the well-known exceptional points (EPs).

According to mathematical studies [20], EPs are defined in relation to *one* continuum. Their physical meaning is studied therefore, up to now, mostly in systems that are embedded in one well-defined common environment. The results of many different papers show their




FIG. 4: The same as Fig. 2 but $\omega^{(1)} = \omega^{(2)} \neq 0$. The parameters are the same as in Fig. 1 left

meaning for the dynamical behavior of open quantum systems, among others for phase transitions. For references see the review [8].

Most states of physical systems are coupled, however, to different channels (environments). For example, the transmission through a small system (e.g. a quantum dot) is related to, at least, two channels, the entrance and the exit channel. The transmission through such systems is studied by many authors in many different papers by using dif-

ferent methods. In the present paper, it is studied for the first time in the framework of the non-Hermitian quantum physics without additional assumptions (such as, e.g., tight-binding) by taking into account that the (localized) system is embedded in more than one environment, i.e. that it is coupled to more than one channel. The results are compared to those known for open quantum systems embedded in one common environment. The similarities and differences are the following.

- Far from singular points, the spectroscopic properties of the system are influenced only marginal by its embedding into an environment. This result is independent of the number of environments.
- In the neighborhood of singular points (EPs), the dynamical behavior of the system is determined by nonlinear processes which are caused by the existence of the singular points. The nonlinear processes restore, in any case, the resonance structure of the cross section obtained without EM. This causes the possibility to describe the system without taking into account EM and EPs in the *one-channel* case [12]. In the *two-channel* case, however, it gives rise to an enhancement of the transmission at maximum width bifurcation (or maximum level repulsion). This effect is measurable.

An experimental test of the formalism of the non-Hermitian description of open quantum systems is therefore possible in the two-channel (or more-channel) case, while it is impossible [12] in the one-channel case. Although EM is a second-order effect, it may become important in the neighborhood of EPs due the nonlinear processes dominating the dynamics in this parameter range.

We underline once more that these processes are related to internal properties of the eigenstates of a non-Hermitian Hamilton operator. They are *not* involved in any version of Hermitian quantum physics.

According to early studies [28] of open quantum systems by means of a non-Hermitian Hamilton operator, short-lived states appear together with long-lived ones at high level density even without changing the coupling strength between system and environment. These states result from the phenomenon resonance trapping occurring in the regime of overlapping resonances [30].

In some papers, this phenomenon is studied as a function of the coupling strength between system and environment and is called segregation of decay widths [31]. Here the

short-living states are called superradiant states and the long-lived ones subradiant states. This formalism is applied also to the description of transmission, see e.g. [17, 18]. In this formalism, an enhancement of transmission is related to the existence of a superradiant state (together with subradiant states).

In contrast to this interpretation, the enhancement of transmission in a certain critical parameter range is, according to the results obtained by us in the present paper, *not* caused by the existence of a superradiant state. Correspondingly, subradiant states do not appear in our calculations.

Instead, the enhancement of the transmission in a certain energy window occurs, in our calculations, due to nonlinear processes. It is related to the non-rigidity of the phases of the eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{H}$ in the neighborhood of EPs and to the EM of the states via the environment. The numerical results show clearly that an enhancement of the transmission in a certain energy window is correlated with a reduction of the phase rigidity, when averaged over energy in this window.

This result is the same as that obtained in [14]. In this paper, the transmission through a system with many states is calculated numerically by using the tight-binding lattice model (according to Datta [32]) with one channel in each of the two attached identical leads. As a result of this calculation, the phase rigidity, averaged over the considered energy window, and the transmission are anti-correlated. Thus, the two very different methods (each of which solves the problem exactly) produce qualitatively the same results.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Considering the results of the present paper, we arrive at the following conclusion. A direct experimental test of the formalism of non-Hermitian quantum physics is possible by investigating the question whether or not the observed enhanced transmission in a certain parameter range is related to the existence of a superradiant state. According to theory [31], a superradiant state appears if the coupling strength between system and environment increases. It appears always together with subradiant long-lived states.

In contrast to this statement, our results show that an enhanced transmission in a certain parameter region is caused by the properties of the eigenfunctions of the non-Hermitian Hamilton operator $\mathcal{H}$, above all by the non-rigid phases of its eigenfunctions. A special state

which is strongly coupled to the environment and is correlated with a partial decoupling of other states from the environment, does not exist.

Summarizing we state that open quantum systems embedded in two (or more) environments are abounded in very many interesting aspects of non-Hermitian quantum physics. They allow, on the one hand, to test experimentally the basic features of non-Hermitian quantum physics. On the other hand, they provide the possibility of many promising applications.

Acknowledgment

We are indebted to Jon Bird for valuable discussions.

-
- [1] A. Bohr and B.R. Mottelson *Nuclear Structure I, II*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Singapore 1999
 - [2] H. Friedrich and D. Wintgen, Phys. Rev. A **31**, 3964 (1985)
 - [3] H. Friedrich and D. Wintgen, Phys. Rev. A **32**, 3231 (1985)
 - [4] I. Rotter and A.F. Sadreev, Phys. Rev. E **71**, 046204 (2005)
 - [5] E.N. Bulgakov and A.F. Sadreev, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 033856 (2016) and references therein
 - [6] Y. Yoon, M.-G. Kang, T. Morimoto, M. Kida, N. Aoki, J. L. Reno, Y. Ochiai, L. Mourokh, J. Fransson, and J. P. Bird, Phys. Rev. X **2**, 021003 (2012)
 - [7] S. Xiao, Y. Yoon, Y.-H. Lee, J. P. Bird, Y. Ochiai, N. Aoki, J. L. Reno, and J. Fransson, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 165435 (2016)
 - [8] I. Rotter, J. Phys. A **42**, 153001 (2009)
 - [9] H. Eleuch and I. Rotter, Eur. Phys. J. D **69**, 229 (2015)
 - [10] H. Eleuch and I. Rotter, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 042116 (2016)
 - [11] H. Eleuch and I. Rotter, Eur. Phys. J. D **69**, 230 (2015)
 - [12] H. Eleuch and I. Rotter, Phys. Rev. A **95**, 022117 (2017)
 - [13] E.N. Bulgakov, I. Rotter, and A.F. Sadreev, Phys. Rev. E **74**, 056204 (2006)
 - [14] E.N. Bulgakov, I. Rotter, and A.F. Sadreev, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 214302 (2007)
 - [15] R.G. Nazmitdinov, K.N. Pichugin, I. Rotter and P. Seba, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 056214 (2001)

- [16] R.G. Nazmitdinov, K.N. Pichugin, I. Rotter and P. Seba, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 085322 (2002)
- [17] G.L. Celardo, A. Biella, L. Kaplan, and F. Borgonovi, Fortschr. Phys. **61**, 250 (2013)
- [18] G.L. Celardo and L. Kaplan, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 155108 (2009)
- [19] In contrast to the definition that is used in, for example, nuclear physics, we define the complex energies before and after diagonalization of $\mathcal{H}$ by $\varepsilon_k = e_k + \frac{i}{2}\gamma_k$ and $\mathcal{E}_k = E_k + \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_k$, respectively, with $\gamma_k \leq 0$ and $\Gamma_k \leq 0$ for decaying states. This definition will be useful when discussing systems with *gain* (positive widths) and *loss* (negative widths).
- [20] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, Springer, Berlin 1966
- [21] I. Rotter, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 036213 (2001)
- [22] A.I. Magunov, I. Rotter and S.I. Strakhova, J. Phys. B **34**, 29 (2001)
- [23] U. Günther, I. Rotter and B.F. Samsonov, J. Phys. A **40**, 8815 (2007)
- [24] B. Wahlstrand, I.I. Yakimenko, and K.F. Berggren, Phys. Rev. E **89**, 062910 (2014)
- [25] I. Rotter and J.P. Bird, Rep. Prog. Phys. **78**, 114001 (2015)
- [26] J.B. Gros, U. Kuhl, O. Legrand, F. Mortessagne, E. Richalot, and D. Savin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 224101 (2014)
- [27] H. Eleuch and I. Rotter, arXiv 1702.08257 (Feb 2017)
- [28] P. Kleinwächter and I. Rotter, Phys. Rev. C **32**, 1742 (1985)
- [29] I. Rotter, Phys. Rev. E **68**, 016211 (2003)
- [30] I. Rotter, Rep. Prog. Phys. **54**, 635 (1991)
- [31] N. Auerbach and V. Zelevinsky, Rep. Prog. Phys. **74**, 106301 (2011)
- [32] S. Datta, *Electronic Transport in Mesoscopic Systems*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995